

Serial No. 09/922,032
Reply to Office Action of January 5, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 11, and 19 are amended. Claims 4 and 14 are canceled.

Claims 9 and 19 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because of multiple dependency. In response to the objection to claims 9 and 19, the clauses containing the reference to the previous claims have been deleted from the claims. No new matter is deemed to be added by this deletion. Further, the claims are deemed to be written in proper form as the term "said scripts" still has proper antecedent basis.

Claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al (US Patent No. 5,537,592) in view of Golshani et al (US Patent No. 5,787,137). The rejection of claims 1 and 11, as amended, under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 have been further amended to more properly claim the nature of the "abstract format" as including "one or more views", and that the views "provide a common abstraction of differences between the first database format and the second database format". No new matter has deemed to be introduced into claims 1 and 11. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 11 can be found, inter alia, in the specification at page 13, line 14, through page 14, line 2, and also in FIG. 3.

The Examiner's helpful citations to the exact teachings in the King and Golshani references have been thoroughly reviewed. In particular, the citation regarding the "views" as found in King with regard to claims 4 and 14 (now canceled) has been carefully reviewed and is not deemed to be pertinent to the patentability of claims 1 and 11 as amended, which contain all of the limitations of canceled claims 4 and 14, and other limitations as explained above. The Golshani reference, not cited as being pertinent to claims 4 and 14, is also deemed not to be pertinent to the patentability of claims 1 and 11 as amended. Since neither of the

Serial No. 09/922,032
Reply to Office Action of January 5, 2005

references are pertinent to the patentability of claims 1 and 11, the combination thereof is deemed not to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in amended claims 1 and 11.


For these reasons, claims 1 and 11 are deemed to be patentable over the combination of cited references and allowable under 35 USC 103(a). The remaining dependent claims are deemed to be also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

4/5, 2005


Peter J. Meza, No. 32,920
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5906 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax